(7)

FILED
NOV 6 1944
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

In the Supreme Court

OF THE

United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1944

No. 291

WILLIAM F. HERRON,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR A REHEARING.

WILLIAM F. HERRON,
645 Mills Building, San Francisco 4, California,
Petitioner in Propria Persona.

PERNAU-WALSH PRINTING CO., SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Table of Authorities Cited

Cases

	Page
Collins v. Welsh, 75 Fed. (2d) 894, 99 A. L. R. 1319, certiorari denied, 55 S. Ct. 921, 295 U. S. 762, 79 L. Ed. 1704	2
Dunn v. California, 311 U. S. 701, 61 S. Ct. 139, 85 L. Ed. 454	2
Long v. California, 311 U. S. 698, 61 S. Ct. 136, 85 L. Ed. 452	2
Schoenamsgruber v. Hamburg American Lines, 293 U. S. 547, 55 S. Ct. 125, 79 L. Ed. 651	2

Miscellaneous

United States Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment	3

In the Supreme Court
OF THE
United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1944

No. 291

WILLIAM F. HERRON,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR A REHEARING.

To the Honorable Harlan Fiske Stone, Chief Justice of the United States, and to the Honorable Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

The petition of William F. Herron for a rehearing of the order made by this Honorable Court the 16th day of October, 1944, denying the petition for a writ of certiorari for failure to comply with the rules respectfully shows to Your Honors:

1. The petition for a writ of certiorari on file herein complies with the rules of this Honorable Court in all respects. It contains a short and summary state-

ment of the matter involved, a statement particularly disclosing the basis upon which it is contended that this Court has jurisdiction to review the judgment in question, a statement of the grounds upon which it is contended that the questions involved are substantial, the stage of the proceedings and the manner in which the Federal questions were raised, and the reasons relied upon for the allowance of writ. Petitioner, in the preparation of the petition, followed the form which he has heretofore used in other petitions for writs of certiorari to this Honorable Court. Among these are:

Schoenamsgruber v. Hamburg American Lines, 293 U. S. 547, 55 S. Ct. 125, 79 L. Ed. 651, granting certiorari;

Collins v. Welsh, 75 Fed. (2d) 894, 99 A. L. R. 1319, certiorari denied, 55 S. Ct. 921, 295 U. S. 762, 79 L. Ed. 1704;

Dunn v. California, 311 U. S. 701, 61 S. Ct. 139, 85 L. Ed. 454;

Long v. California, 311 U. S. 698, 61 S. Ct. 136, 85 L. Ed. 452.

These are only the most recent cases in which petitioner has prepared petitions for writs of certiorari to this Court, and in no case has the accuracy of his procedure or his complete compliance with the rules been drawn into question.

2. The printing of the record pursuant to the provisions of Section 7 of Rule 38 was wholly unnecessary because the sole point urged as a ground for the granting of the writ was the invalidity of certain provisions of the so-called State Bar Act of the State

of California which are printed in full in the appendix to the petition for a writ of certiorari, Appendix B, page 27, et seq.

3. The portion of the record showing the stage of the proceedings and the manner in which the Federal questions were first raised was not printed in the petition and ~~was not~~ included in the typewritten transcript for the ~~reasons~~ set forth in the affidavit of the petition on file herein: to wit, that the respondent suppressed and refused to furnish the record of the proceedings at the time that petitioner first called into question the validity of the statute upon the ground of its being repugnant to the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. As an appendix to this petition your petitioner prints a copy of the said affidavit omitting the caption and jurat.

Your petitioner further submits that there has been a substantial compliance by him with the rules of this Court, that a substantial Federal question has been raised, which, in the interests of the legal profession throughout the entire country, ought to be settled by this Honorable Court upon the merits.

Wherefore, your petitioner prays for a rehearing in the above entitled cause and for the issuance of a writ of certiorari as prayed for in the petition.

Dated, San Francisco, California,
November 1, 1944.

WILLIAM F. HERRON,
Petitioner in Propria Persona.

CERTIFICATE.

I hereby certify that in my judgment the foregoing petition is well founded in law, as well as in fact, and that said petition is not interposed for delay.

Dated, San Francisco, California,
November 1, 1944.

WILLIAM F. HERRON,
Petitioner in Propria Persona.

(Appendix Follows.)